Mr. Lonnie Hudkins
5 Chestnut St.,
Franklinville, NY 14737

5/26/96

Dear Lonnie,

I've been intending to write you for some time. I've not used the phone because increasing weakness has me retiring even earlier, before you are at work, and because I've been working intensely to get as much on paper as I can while I can. The volume is now considerable. It is a series of manuscripts under the general title Inside the JFK Assassination Industry, Two parts were published by Carroll & Graf/Richard Gallen, as I suppose you know. The second to be published was sat on after I finished it in 1992 until last year. Then it was published with the descriptive title omitted from the cover so neither the stores nor the book purchasers had the slightest idea of what it is about. They also forgot the index which had been set in type and not even read and corrected. It is NEVER AGAIN! For a long time I could not get any copies. I offered to buy them six times without response! Finally, months later, I got them to send a box to Jim Lesar, who promised to hold a Washington press conference for me and then didn't. Eventually I got them if you do not have a copy and would like one.

If they did a single thing to promote either book, even sent out a single review copy, I've not heard of it.

What I went through on these two, which got to them by accident, I do not want to go through again so what I'm doing is intended as a record for history. In the form of book manuscripts.

Some I started some time ago and laid aside for others that, when finished, I have been returning to. The one I'm working on now is on the men, of the Commission and more of its staff. It has the working title of Honorable Men. In the Marc Antony sense.

In lengthy parts that deal with the executive sessions of 1/22/24 and 27 I came on this reference to you. I delayed writing you because I believed I would come to more. I have. This more is the chapter in which I have a thick file of FBI and some Secret Service reports. I've that chapter to reread and work on but I wont get to that until tomorrow now. With those reports I have a copy of my 12/21/92 letter to you to which I recall no response. I have no intention of writing what may embarrass you but if you were fired over that by Hobby that was pretty dirty and because he was under Jaworski pressure even dirtier and I' like to include such dirty things when they all refused to make any investigation at all. As they should have. If you do not have that letter in it I also said that the idea of getting you fired seem to originate with the Commission 1/27/64.

I'm sorry you do not want to talk about 110669 but you seem to be the only

source of it. It would be good if the record for history could be better, more informative.

The records say that both Sweatt and Alexander were your sources. There is almost no reference to goulden. You are quoted as saying Sweatt was your source. Alexander is quoted as saying he knows nothing at all about it. You are quoted in another memo s saying that "A local official told him that Oswald was an FBI or CIA informant." Belli is also a source. He told a Hearst reporter that Oswald was an FBI informant for thirteen weeks. Ruby for eight weeks,

I have a fat file of those documents to reread after all these years before I reread what I wrote so long ago. In skimming them I saw these references to you.

What I am writing about is not you or Sweatt or Alexander, etc. It is about the men of the Commission and the dishonesty of some. This includes my relationship with Russell, from whose archive I have some records that reflect a high opinion of my work and what he said to the Commission in the executive session he formed when the presses were about to roll on the Report. He refused to agree with the single bullet theory and was convinced the agencies had not told all they knew about Oswald.

Who was, by the eay, strongly anti-USSR and anti-Communist.

But if the situation has changed, as perhaps from the death of a source, I'd like to know anything else you can tell me. That would reflect what should have been and was not investigated. Which all those men had the obligation to do.

They kept on talking about having to interview you but as you know they never did and I believe never intended to despite what they were saying. Hoover encouaged them to even if you'd assert privilege. McCloy said you had none. Based on what he said was British precedent.

I hope your health has improved or at least is steady and not deteriorating. Mine is and has been. A month ago I was in the hospital for two weeks. They said it was and was not conhestive heart failure. They found my kidneys are not as effecient as they should be and that I'm anemic but they found no blockages there. Only hardening of the arteries, as there is elsewhere. Haven't been able to use stairs for several years, must support myself with a cane when I ~~xxxxx~~ walk and after about 200 steps have to stop and rest. But I'm still writing and will as long as I can. In 10 days I have a cardiology checkup at Johns Hopkins. They did three bypasses on me in 1989. Lil is close to needing a hip replacement, so we have his and her canes. Her's is an antique. Was her grandfathers.

We hope you are all as well as you can be. Sorry it has not been possible for you to get here.

Our best,

Harold